

19.
AMERICAN SLAVERY,

CONTRASTED WITH

BIBLE SERVITUDE,

as shown by the following

— BY —

W. H. SNYDER,

OF

LEXINGTON, . . . ILL.

1857

American Slavery contrasted with Bible Servitude.

REV. XVIII. 11.—13.—No man buyeth their merchandise any more ; the merchandise of gold and silver, &c., and slaves, and souls of men.

The word translated “slaves” is the greek *somaton*, the literal translation of which is of bodies. It is construed by the Latin word *corpus* and signifies bodies. Well, slaves have bodies, and therefore there can be no important error in the translation. It seems that mystical Babylon here spoken of had two things in view. One was vastly to enrich herself, and the other was to indulge herself in delicious living. This spirit she likewise imparted to those with whom she held her intercourses. Indeed it needs no great effort with men in this state of existence, to inspire them with ideas of growing rich, and living deliciously. The articles enumerated by the divine teacher, though some of them may be useful, yet, most were such as could only contribute to the self-indulgence of those who felt that they were rich. She says in her self gratulation, “I sit a Queen and am no widow,” “and shall see no sorrow;” and therefore, like all who cultivate only self-indulgence, she concludes that it is her privilege to grow rich, and to use her riches in delicious living; and to do so too, by trading in the bodies and souls of men. The divine teacher in this chapter is speaking of Babylon, which in the next preceding chapter was represented as “a women sitting on a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, and the women was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.” And after describing her more particularly, he says: “the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the Kings of the Earth. This could alone apply to Rome, for no city then, nor since, has so much reigned over the kings of the earth as she then did, in secular affairs; and since then, she has borne full as great sway in spiritual matters. We see that this dominion sought for great riches, for the purpose of self-indulgence, and she was by no means scrupulous about the articles in which she sought to acquire her riches. This will be abundantly plain when we consider, that she made merchandise of the bodies and souls of men. A traffic in the souls of men may be carried on when men are deluded and led to believe falsehoods. Yet when men are directly sold as beasts, and articles of merchandise, and are treated as beasts, as must be done where such traffic is much carried on, then they who carry on such business, do most emphatically trade, both in the bodies and souls of men. Trading in the bodies and souls of men, is, perhaps, the most enriching trade that was ev-

er conducted. This, mystical Babylon being very skilfull to perceive what articles of trade would soonest increase her riches, used for her benefit. It is computed that a slave on the African coast, or in an African market, will cost on an average one dollar. They have been purchased for less, and their cost on the passage from Africa to this country, can, from the manner they are kept, cost very little. Perhaps no more usually, than ten dollars per head, and when here, one will sell for several hundred. The traffic then must be very enriching to the first purchaser, and when slave breeders raise them here, they certainly cannot from the manner they are kept, cost them much, and they sell from a few hundred to a few thousand dollars. So that slave trading and slave breeding are among the most enriching of all kinds of trade. We charge the African slave trade directly upon the Pope of Rome. The Pope, as the disposer of the whole world, who has the right to depose and set up Kings, and give any portion of it to whom he pleased; he gave Africa to Spain and Portugal, as his two most faithful subjects, and gave them license to carry the inhabitants into slavery. This was done when the continent of America was discovered, and hands might be employed here, to cultivate the soil.—Then this business commenced of transporting slaves to America. Spain engaged with England to furnish for her colonies forty thousand slaves annually, for a number of years. Our object is not to dwell on the horrors of the African slave trade, but to show what it is here in this day, and compare it with the servitude in other ages and countries of the world. Let us now go back and begin with what is called the slavery of antiquity. Some will tell us that slavery has always existed. They must mean by this that it has existed as long as man has been in this world, and then, if they mean slavery, such as American slavery, they cannot utter a more direct historical falsehood. If these dogmatists know what they mean and they will tell us that service has been rendered from one intelligent being to another, as long as such being has existed, then we will give them credit for telling the truth. And we say farther that in Heaven itself there is service rendered by all from one to another. On earth it has been and must always be so. Creatures are all made to serve for one another. Slavery, however, is a different thing, and especially such slavery as we find in these States of our Union.

There is no history extant that even mentions a word of servants 'till we come down to the time of Abraham; and as historians, we cannot assert that a custom existed of which history is entirely silent. Abraham lived two thousand years after the creation of man. So that one-third of the present age of the world of mankind had passed away, and yet no mention is made even of servants, except in the prophecy of Noah. Servants had no existence in the world 'till the time of Abraham, if history proves anything. In those ancient times men served themselves. But what was the servitude that was first noted on the page of history? It surely was not anything like the slavery we now see amongst us, or in neighboring States. The occasion which led to the mention of servants was the following: Several Kings from the East had made war upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and

others with them ; and had overcome the Sodomites and those confederated with them, and had ravaged their country. They took all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah, and their victuals, and went their way. They took Lot, Abraham's brother's son, who dwelt in Sodom, his goods, and departed. And there came one that had escaped, and told Abraham. And when Abraham heard that his brother was taken captive ; he armed his trained servants born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan. He divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobab. He brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother's Lot, and his goods, the women, also, and the people. There is nothing in this piece of history that will prove that these servants were the property of Abraham. Their service must have been voluntary, or they would not have been armed and put in power to throw off their master's yoke. Oppressors never trust arms in the hands of the oppressed, or they would assert their liberty.— This has always been so, in ancient as well as modern times. It is certain, forced service could not be continued if servants were armed, unless they were guarded by a force superior to themselves. The King of Egypt would keep down the spirit of the Israelites by hard service in brick and mortar, so that they might not attempt to get out of the land. He knew very well that they considered Canaan to be their inheritance, and that if they were trained to arms they would not continue in Egyptian bondage. So the Spartans had their servants to do their common labors, and the citizens bore arms. In what nation has it not been so ? Armies are either made up of citizens, or hirelings, not forced slaves, so this army of Abraham. They were not slaves. Servant, may be taken from one who dedicates himself to the service of another, by the choice of his own will. Thus, Joshua was the servant of Moses, Elisha of Elijah, Gehazi of Elisha, and the Apostles of Christ. Servant put for the subjects of a Prince, as the servants of Pharaoh, the servants of Saul, of David, of Solomon, &c. It is difficult to determine exactly what relation these servants stood in to Abraham. Yet it is certain they were not chattel slaves. In those times of patriarchal government, smaller families would voluntarily connect themselves with the household of the more powerful, for protection against the impositions of the lawless, and oppressive, who ravaged the country, and took away the goods, and moveables of their neighbors, without any restraint, but a more powerful arm, or combination than their own. This was the condition of the world in the time of Abraham, and it is altogether in order to conclude that these had become attached to the household of this eminent Patriarch, on that principle. And he may have employed many to attend to his business. For we are told that Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. And this will likewise prove that their service was not constrained, more than that of children to their parents, and that the service was entirely of the same nature. In the same way children may now be taken, who have no parents, or whose parents neglect them, and train them up to be useful to themselves and useful members of the community in which they live. That

this view of the nature of the service rendered to Abraham is correct, may be gathered from the law that God afterwards gave him for the regulation of his household. This we find in the seventh of Genesis. God had made a covenant with Abram, promising him great property, changing his name from Abram to Abraham, and gave him as a seal, or confirmation of that covenant. the right of circumcision. "God said unto Abraham, this is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised; it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you, and he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed." "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant; the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

It is evident from this, that slavery, as we see it in our day, according to God's law, could not exist in the family of Abraham. Those whom he procured for servants, or those born of such in his house, must be circumcised or they could make no part of his household; they must be cut off; that is, cast out of the family, as Ishmael afterwards was, for railing at Isaac, so that he should not be heir with the child of promise. The system of servitude then that God allowed Abraham to practice was, to take servants into his family, from other families and incorporate them as members of his own household. If they could not be induced to submit to the laws of his house, they could make no part of his household. They must be cut off, or turned away from his family and his service.

This is all that is implied by being cut off. It was not to destroy their lives, nor to sell them to a slave driver, and chain them to a gang, and drive them to a foreign country. No, it was to let them go or to expel them from the household, and to let them go where they pleased. That was the servitude which Abraham was allowed to practice, and his descendents were not allowed greater latitude. This servitude rendered to Abraham did not possess any resemblance of American slavery. The same principle was again acted upon, when the passover was instituted, at the time that the Israelites went out of Egypt. "The Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, this is the ordinance of the passover; there shall no stranger eat thereof, but every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. Here it is plain that a servant bought with money, was to be an incorporated member of the family. A foreigner might sojourn among them, or might be hired, and such, as long as they rejected circumcision, did not become one of the people, but if a man among the Israelites bought a servant, that servant must submit to all the laws of his house, or be turned away. In thus submitting, the servant became eligible to all the advantages of all the laws of the Israelites. Buying servants, by Israelites, of their heathen neighbors, was virtually proselyting them to the service of the true

God, and incorporate them with His people. Hence we can see that it was not a system of cruelty, and oppression, but of special benevolence. The term of service of a Hebrew could only be six years.—As in Ex. 21. 2. If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve thee ; in the seventh, he shall go free for nothing, and as we have seen in the original covenant with Abraham, that those bought of the heathen should be incorporated with the families of the Israelites who bought them. It therefore follows, that all bought with money, according to the provision that God made in his law to Moses, could only remain in servitude as long as the Hebrew, and those who would not submit to circumcision could not be retained at all ; they could be hired or left to go where they pleased.

This some may say was giving the refractory and unyielding an advantage over the Israelites and those who became proselytes to their religion and submitted to their laws. But not so. It was esteemed a great advantage in the Roman Empire, to be able to say, “I am a Roman citizen.” It is an advantage in any government, to be a citizen of that government, though there are burdens to bear that are not imposed upon strangers. If there are peculiar burdens, there are likewise peculiar favors. So it was with the Israelites. Though strangers and foreigners, were dealt with in peculiar kindness, yet there were favors for the citizens above what strangers could enjoy. There was provision made in the law, that if a servant, when his term of service expired wished to stay with his master, he might do so. “Then his master shall bring him unto the judges ; he shall also bring him unto the door, or unto the door-post, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.” We see that this service must be voluntary, and the servant must even submit to have his ear bored through with an awl, for the privilege of being such. This seems no great encouragement for choosing servitude before freedom, by the law-giver. As to the “term forever” we shall consider that hereafter. What is said in the command to Moses in Lev. 25. 44. 45. 46. is but a repetition of what was given to Abraham as noticed above. The Hebrews were only to be purchased to help them out of their debts. Such purchases could only be accidental. But if they wanted to extend their business, and employ more hands, they might purchase them of the heathen. He says, “both thy bondsmen and bondmaids shall be of the heathens that are round about you ; of them shall ye buy bondsmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers, that do sojourn among you, of them shall you buy and of their families that are with you, which they beget in your land, and they shall be your possession. Ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession, and they shall be your bondsmen forever.” Here, as to Abraham, there was a privilege to obtain children from the heathen, around the Israelites.—But subject to the same law that was given to Abram. ¶ They were to be circumcised, and so they virtually became citizens of the nation. But they were to be a possession and inheritance of their children. Yes, surely as long as their term of servitude lasted, and it has

appeared above that it was fixed to six years. No, but say those who have only read the translation, for the time is ever. How can that be, if the term forever is to be taken in an unlimited sense? Master, nor servant, can remain in the relations in which they stand to each other for ever, and that relation cannot go beyond this life. So that the term cannot absolutely be unlimited. This construction would clash with that command given to Abraham. It, however, all harmonizes if we get the true meaning of the word rendered forever.

The word in the Hebrew is *olim*, and is construed by the Latin *seculum*, the first meaning of this is an age. The other shades of meaning have no relation to periods of time. An age is simply a term of time fixed by some bounds. The age of man is fixed by his natural life. The continuance of a year is fixed to the time that it takes the earth to make a circuit around the sun. The age of man's minority in this country, is fixed by positive law, at twenty one years, and so the age of servitude given to the Israelites was fixed at six years. We have already presented Ex. 21. 2. to show that the Hebrew servant could only be retained for six years, unless he choose to have it otherwise. But as there is something in another place, Levit. 25, said about the Hebrew servant going free at the year of Jubilee, which was every fiftieth year, it is inferred that the term of service could be extended forty-nine years. This would present a contradiction in the law, which no consistent law-giver would do, and we dare not suppose that infinite knowledge and wisdom could be so inconsistent. Six years was the full extent of the term; beyond that it could not go. But if one was sold into servitude five, four, three, two, or one year before the year of jubilee or six months, one month, or one day, he was positively to be free when the jubilee trumpet was sounded. This will reconcile the two contradictory passages. But to show how this law was put in practice by the government, we turn to Jer. 35. 12. &c. "The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, this saith the Lord the God of Israel: I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondsmen, saying at the end of seven years, let ye go every man his brother an Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee; and when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee; but your fathers harkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear." Here the law is plainly limited to six years. The introduction "at the end of seven years" must intend, at the boundary of seven years, or a period of seven years, beginning or end. Every seventh year was a sabbatical year, or year of rest. It is positively stated, "when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee," so whatever is meant by the sentence "at the end of seven years," six years was all the time that the service was to continue. In the year of Jubilee, all the land that had been sold, was to return to the original owners, and men who had been sold returned to the possession of themselves. After appointing the seventh year as a sabbatical or year of rest, the lawgiver says, Lev. 26. 8. and thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee; and the space of seven sabbaths of years shall be unto the forty-

nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of Jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month. Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family."

Every man's possession here was restored, and every servant had liberty to return to his family, or go where he pleased. This shows us what the servitude was, which God appointed among His own people. And we see that it enjoins as complete a system, both of justice and benevolence, as can be devised among an association of such beings as men.

If a man was indebted to another and had no means to pay, the creditor had no power to inflict torture upon him, or to injure him in any way, but to employ him in his service, or for his benefit, in the service of another. Then he was protected by humane laws, while in the service; and if he owed ever so much, his service could not be forced beyond the term of six years. If those who refer to the Bible to justify slavery, would adopt the code of the Bible and practice accordingly, all agitation about slavery would cease. The advocates of freedom would then see all the freedom, and all the justice, and all the humanity which man is capable of, in this imperfect state of his being. Then would be seen the force of what Moses said of the law that God had given to Israel, Deut. 4, 5. "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep, therefore, and do them; for this is your wisdom, and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear these statutes and say surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? Now, before going any farther, I would just advise the advocates for slavery, who say it is a divine institution, to look at the divine law, and adopt such a system of servitude, which is simply to employ the poor and pay them for their service, either before it is rendered, or immediately afterwards. If they take in servants, or buy them from abroad, let it be as the Israelites did to make them members of their families, to teach them a knowledge of the true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent to instruct them in all useful knowledge, and then at the end of six years let them go free; nor then send them empty away, but give them liberally, that they may begin life for themselves and their dependants. Then their slavery, if they please to call it so, will be a divine institution, and then it will likewise accord with that injunction of Jesus Christ, which He says is the sum and substance of the law and the prophets, "as ye would that men should do to you, do even so to them." And then too, this divine law will appear to stand directly in contrast to a custom or practice, or a crime, as it would seem, from the manner in which it is presented by divine authority. Ex. 21 —16, He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found

in his hand he shall surely be put to death." This stands opposed to the divine institutions we have presented above. The Divine Being denounces it as a capital crime, and consequently it must be a law of Hell, instead of a divine law. Let slave-holders and advocates, then consider which of these opposite systems they advocate and support. The servitude that God instituted was not intended to enrich the master at the expense of the servant. It was for the mutual benefit of master and servant, but especially that good will, kindness, and mercy might be shown to the poor. The Israelites often transgressed the just and merciful law that God gave them, and oppressed, instead of protecting and favoring the poor. Yet oppression was vastly more carried on by other nations than by them. We see the Egyptians made the Israelites serve with cruel bondage. The ancient Romans had the power of life and death over their slaves. Notwithstanding this it seems that in all nations, ancient and modern, besides our own, slaves became free and were made citizens, and rose to important stations in the nation where they were. It was so with Joseph in Egypt, and cases have occurred like it in the same country since. It has been so in other nations. There have formerly been slaves all over Europe, where there are none now to be found, but in Russia; and the Russian serf is not transferable property. But that merchandizing in the bodies and souls of men ascribed to mystical Babylon, has been carried on for the sole purpose of enriching and aggrandizing the trader and purchaser. The body and soul of the slave, were both used as chattels, to enrich and administer to the pleasure of the holder. This principle stimulated the mind of the piratical adventurer, who went to the coast of the African continent, and there stole all he could of these unsuspecting and defenceless inhabitants; and what he could not steal himself, he induced others to steal, for a pittance in toys, rum, and tobacco; or anything for which he could obtain them. It governed his conduct on the passage, the horrors of which are indistinguishable. It is this principle which governs the conduct of the master in this country toward his slaves. There have been some honorable exceptions; and when they have occurred, they always found a way to emancipate their slaves. The love of money, without any regard to the well being of the slave, governs the master in his management with his slaves. If he can make more money by wearing them out in five years than in seven, he takes the course that will finish their term in five years. And, if under the experiment of feeding them with cotton seeds, a number perish, it is but the loss of a few niggers. If the plan should succeed, the gain would be very great, and a few lives sacrificed to gain the information, can well be afforded by one who owns hundreds of them. But such ideas may shock many who still hold to slavery. But will they keep husband and wife together, and their children, or suffer them to be sold apart never to meet again in this world; or, if they do succeed, to prevent such barbarity while they live, can they give any assurance that when they are dead, they shall not be placed upon the auction stand and sold to some cruel monster in human shape? This they cannot prevent, unless they make them free.

Neither can holders of slaves prevent the perpetration among them of vice in general. The foundation is laid in violation of God's law, and the rights of their fellow men. A poisonous tree can never bear wholesome fruit. The commencement of the system is a falsehood, and a falsehood can only be kept in countenance by lies. Hence the false assertions that slavery is a divine institution, that it is a blessing to the slave; that it is according to Bible-teaching; that a republic cannot exist without; that it has existed as long as man has inhabited the earth. All these are asserted and all untrue.

American slavery is that which in the law of God is called man-stealing. We have already presented the doom of infinite wisdom upon that crime; that it is death. This we took from Ex. 21.—16. in Tim. 1 and 10th, "men stealers" are classed with murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers, and the whole catalogue of the worst of crimes. But slaveholders will say that they did not steal their slaves; but if that is so, they keep them in the same condition that they were placed by the robbers who did steal them. They keep them deprived of the rights which God made inalienable to all men. But they may farther say that their slaves are only the children of those stolen in Africa. Well, then what do those who still hold them as slaves, when they arrive at the age of manhood, but steal them away from the exercise of those inalienable rights, which God has given equally to all men to enjoy? They might as well steal them from Africa, and bring them here into slavery, as to deprive them of liberty, and fasten perpetual slavery upon them, when born here.

In the latter case, the depriving them of liberty when born here, is as virtually men-stealing, as to go to Africa, waylay them, and then by superior force, gag and bind them, and bring them here; and under the lash, compel them to toil on the plantation, in a slave State, to raise tobacco, cotton or cane. No sophistry of the slaveholder, can throw from him the odious crime of men-stealing. If he pleads that he got them by inheritance, that will not free him from the guilt of holding stolen property, unless he is arranging to set them free. Nothing but doing his utmost to free them, will release him from the guilt of holding stolen men and women, when any person owns slaves. It will not do to say that the owner of the slaves possesses no other property. All come unto the world bringing nothing with them. Thousands live without any property; thousands upon thousands, lose all they have, and so are left destitute. So that it is no uncommon thing for people to be deprived of property, at all stages of life, and that too, such as have had thousands. Slaveholders would fare no worse than thousands do, if they should have no property after freeing their slaves. But look at the case in the light of justice. If an honest man owed a creditor a large sum of money, and he had only enough to pay him, without retaining a cent, and the creditor demanded immediate payment; would he not give up all and be destitute himself? He surely would if he was an honest man. Many do this and much more, many give up all they have and labor for many years afterwards to pay just demands against them.

Is the holder of slaves the only person who is to be placed above

the claims of justice, for fear he should be without property? In the possession of all other stolen property, the holder gets no sympathy, from the law nor public opinion. Why then should the slaveholder have this sympathy? If sympathy is due to any one, it is due to one who loses it in the pursuit of something useful and good to all men. But much more to the unjustly treated, the abused and suffering slave. Instead of the slaveholder pleading that he has no other property than the slaves he owns, he ought to inquire how he could do justice to them, for their services to him, and then very many of them won't not only give liberty to their slaves, but give them all the property they have, and much more if they had it. We see that slavery apologists have no shadow of justice, as a plea, under which to hide themselves. The first of it is man stealing, robbery, and injustice accompany it in all its course. It is made plausible only by lies, and destruction to master and slave, will be the final result. An undue love of riches, and self-indulgence, has given rise to the whole infernal fabric. God in his word stamps it with the blackest mark of guilt. Death for the stealing, or the holding.

Slavery is, to all intents, abolished in the Declaration of Independence, which was laid down as the foundation of our government, and not only ours, but all free governments. There is in it, laid down as a self-evident truth, that the Creator has endowed all men with inalienable rights, being born equal, to pursue the blessings of life, liberty, and happiness. This doctrine, they who framed the Declaration of Independence learned from the Bible, or those who taught Bible truth.—It is the doctrine of the Bible. The Constitution maintains the same principle of freedom.

What the Constitution says about delivering persons to claimants, who flee from one State to another, cannot by any forced construction of the language, be made to relate to slaves. The Constitution is founded upon the principles of justice laid down as a self-evident truth in the Declaration, and in the prologue to the articles of the Constitution, justice to all; the cultivation of peace, happiness, and good will is declared to be the intent of the instrument. Well, if the Constitution lays down the general principle of justice and righteousness, can it afterwards admit an article, or sentence that would by its own principle be wrong? No, that would be impossible, unless the framers meant to make fools of themselves, and to play the fool with the nation who received it. But they meant neither. But when men were lawfully held to service, and by going into another State, defrauded a claimant, then they were to be delivered up.—Slaves are not lawfully held to service. When the Constitution enjoins justice to all men, it does not say that it is just to steal a man and reduce him to slavery. No, if a State should make a law to do wrong; the Constitution does not give a word of countenance to such a law in any State; but to the contrary, it demands that all the members of the government should administer justice, to all within their several bounds. Slavery, by this general principle of the Constitution, is condemned. But more particularly, the Constitution de-

mands of every State, a Republican Constitution for their State government. A republic is a government where all the inhabitants take a part in the management of choosing officers, and making laws.

But slaves take no part in conducting the government of a State; and therefore, a slave State cannot have a republican Constitution; or if they have, they make it nugatory in their practice. But again, the Constitution allows every person born in the United States, the right of citizenship. But by the usages of slave States this right is denied to millions. The right of habeas corpus is also granted to every person by the Constitution. But denied by slavery.

We see that slavery outrages the law of God; the rights of humanity; that it tramples under foot the Constitution, which in its demands of justice perfectly agrees with the law of God, for it is subordinate thereto. It also outrages the law of the land. That law as Blackstone repeatedly says, being in harmony with the law of the Bible. What precedent then has slavery for its justification? Nothing from a civilized nation. It gets its support from the blackest barbarians, and from the vilest superstitionists and despots, that ever cursed the earth. American slavery is a creature put in being by that mystery of wickedness, ecclesiastical Rome, which is mystically called Babylon; which rose from the bottomless pit, and established a power in spiritual and secular Rome, more destructive to the bodies and souls of men, than anything that had been done since the days of Cain. The prophet in vision, says, I saw three unclean spirits, like frogs come out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the false prophet, for they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world. This is most likely one of those spirits.—It proves its rise to be from hell, for it is founded in falsehood, and can only do evil. Destruction is its only work.

Such is American slavery, begotten in the bottomless pit, brought forth in Rome, and sent to America, soon after it was discovered by Columbus, and we now are made to feel the bitterness of the curse. But, what say the advocates for slavery now, the men who framed the Declaration and our Constitution, meant to sustain and justify slavery thereby. They could not mean that, if they understood the language of the Constitution to mean what it says. There is the contrary meaning there, and when an instrument is put into our hands to convey to us the meaning of others, we judge of their meaning by the language used in the instrument. If we are to give the constitution a meaning by construction, then opponents of slavery may construe it to mean that the masters and slaves must change places, as the Mamelukes and their masters did, 'till the masters had served the slaves as long as the slaves had served them; and then, if the masters would consent to accept freedom, all should be free. We only mention this to show how foolish an idea it is to give a constructive meaning to the constitution. It must mean what it says, or it is not worth as much as blank paper, and it enjoins justice to all, and forbids all oppression. It, therefore, gives no countenance to slavery.—But what said the men themselves, who framed the fundamentals of

our government and forfeited their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honors to maintain them? A volume might be written showing their abhorrence of slavery in Congress, and out of it, over the whole country, North and South. We quote what are called Darien Georgia resolutions from the record of Congress, January, 12, 1775; "To show the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motives, but a general love for all mankind, of whatever climate, language or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation, and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of Slavery in America (however the uncultivated state of our country or other specious arguments may plead for it), a practice founded in injustice, and cruelty, highly dangerous to our liberties (as well as our lives), debasing part of our fellow creatures below men, and corrupting the virtue and morals of the rest; is laying the basis of that liberty we contend for (which we pray the Almighty to continue to the latest posterity) upon a very wrong foundation. We therefore, resolve at all times to use our utmost endeavors for the manumission of our slaves in this colony, upon the most safe and equitable footing for the masters themselves." This, it will be seen was from the extreme South, and such was the sentiment of the whole country, both North and South, of those who were in favor of the revolution. They supported equal rights among all men. The Tories who opposed the Revolution, did not unite in these expressions, and it is certain that the most formidable opposition to the revolution, came from the slave States. The enactments which slaveholders find it necessary to make to sustain the cruel system, would disgrace any barbarians of any country or age. From their laws it appears: 1. "The masters may determine the kind, and degree, and time of labor, to which the slaves may be subjected. 2. The master may supply the slave with such food and clothing only, both as to quantity and quality, as he may think proper, or find convenient. 3. The master may, at his discretion, inflict any punishment upon the person of his slave. 4. Slaves have no legal right to any property in things, real or personal; but whatever they may acquire belongs in point of law to their masters. 5. The slave, being a personal chattel, is at all times, liable to be sold absolutely, or mortgaged, or leased, at the will of his master. 6. He may also be sold by process of law, for the satisfaction of the debts of the living, or the debts of and bequests of a deceased master, at the suit of creditors or legatees. 7. A slave cannot be a party before a tribunal, in any species of action, against his master, no matter how atrocious may have been the injury received from him. 8. Slaves cannot redeem themselves, nor obtain a change of masters, though cruel treatment have rendered such change necessary for their personal safety. 9. Slaves can make no contract. 10. Slavery is hereditary and perpetual. 11. A slave cannot be a witness against a white person, either in a civil or criminal cause. 12. He cannot be a party in a civil suit. 13. The benefits of education are withheld from the slaves. 14. The means of moral and religious instructions are not granted to the slave; on the contrary, the efforts of the humane and charitable to supply these wants, are discountenanced by law. 15. Submission is required of the slave, not to the will of his master only,

but to that of all other white persons. 16. The penal codes of slaveholding states bear much more severely upon slaves than upon white persons. 17. Slaves are prosecuted and tried upon criminal accusations in a manner inconsistent with the rights of humanity.—Strouds Slave Laws."

The existence of such laws will prove that slavery is not god-like or humane ; but completely infernal. But hear what is said of slavery by one whom slave advocates say favored it. "Testimony of Thomas Jefferson." The whole commerce between master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotisms on one part, and degrading submission on the other. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances." In view of the injustice of the system upon the slave, the same philanthropist, exclaimed, "I tremble for my country when I consider that God is just ! and that His justice will not always sleep !" Now compare this system of unearthly cruelty, despotism, and injustice, with that wise enactment of the law of God, properly tempered with justice and mercy, and then, who that is governed by reason, can have the hardihood to utter the falsehood that slavery, as it is, in the States of the North American Union, is supported by the Bible ? Only man deluded, and blinded by Satan, fired by a love of gain, can look upon it without disgust and horror. Conquerors can wade through human blood to increase their honor and power. And so they who, without regard to justice, will be rich to increase their means of living deliciously, will condescend to anything degrading and oppressive to the poor, and unjust, debasing to all, to accomplish their end. They will traffic in the bodies and souls of their fellow men, degrading their minds and wearing out their bodies, to increase their gain. Such masters not only degrade their slaves, but the business they do. They make it disreputable to do, what man is appointed to, by his Creator, "to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow." This appointment of the Creator is degrading to gentlemen. It is only fit to be done by slaves. Gentlemen must have their time for amusement, fox hunting, gambling, cock and dog fighting ; and night parties, revelries, and drinking brandy with hale good fellows, and to perfect their system of honor, if one in conversation with them happens to speak in a manner to contradict them, even if what he says is true, they must be ready to take his life with the pistol or dirk, or loose their own. Such exercises they must keep in readiness promptly to accomplish, or they are not honorable gentlemen. But useful business, that is degrading, only fit to be done by slaves. Talk of slavery being a divine institution, and taught in the Bible ; when the Bible condemns man-stealing and selling him or holding him in slavery, under the penalty of death ! It is the assertion of the wilfully and wickedly blind. The sum of all law, according to the only perfect Law-giver is, "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye

even so to them." If slaveholders would read the Bible with a view to obey its commands, slavery would be soon put away. The Bible has led to all the freedom in the world. Europe, in obedience to the Bible, has let her slaves go free, and our forefathers in obedience to the Bible, set up a free government. Slaveholding despots are now striving together to obliterate this government from the world. But if they do so, let it be known that they act in violation of what the Bible enjoins.